

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application. Applicant also notes a change of attorneys representing Applicant in this case and a corresponding change of attorney docket number as noted on the first page of this response.

The Office Action of March 3, 2006, rejects Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 4, 5, 19, 20, 27-29, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,617,530 to Lin ("the '530 Lin patent"). And Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '530 Lin patent. Applicant notes with appreciation that Claims 36-41 have been allowed, that Claims 2, 3, 6-12, 14, 16-18, 21-24, and 30 present allowable subject matter but depend from a rejected base claim, and that Claims 25 and 26 would be allowable but for the § 112 rejection.

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 25, and 27; added Claims 42, 51, and 54 to rewrite Claims 2, 11, and 21 in independent form; and added Claims 43-49, 52-53, and 55-56 depending from Claims 42, 50, and 53, respectively, to rewrite Claims 3, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, and 18 depending from Claim 2, Claims 12 and 14 depending from Claim 11, and Claims 22 and 23 depending from Claim 21. Claim 50 has also been added to depend from Claim 43.

Applicant submits herewith a Request for Continued Examination for consideration of this Preliminary Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, and 27 to recite, *inter alia*, that the electronic display device is associated with the floor covering and that the floor covering is adapted to at least partially support the position of the electronic display device, as is described in the application as filed at pages 6 in paragraph 0015 and at page 5 in paragraph 0020 with respect to Figure 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the § 112 rejections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(A)

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 19, 20, 27-29, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the '530 Lin patent. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, and 27 to recite that the floor covering comprises at least one inclined surface that slopes downward and away from a top surface of the floor covering to a floor, as is described in the application as filed at page 6 in paragraph 0021 and as shown in Figures 1, 2, 5, 6, 7A, 7B, 7C, and 8-11. The '530 Lin patent does not teach or suggest a floor covering with at least one inclined surface, such as to aid in a person walking onto or over the floor covering or a wheeled cart rolling onto or over the floor covering. And neither do U.S. Patent 5,620,003 or 6,963,035, cited in the Office Action to further show the state of the art, teach or suggest an inclined surface. Rather, the prior art teaches that a person would step up and onto a scale and lacks any motivation for modifying a scale to include any inclined surfaces. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 25, and 27 are patentable over the prior art and that Claims 2-12, 14, 16-24, 26, and 28-35 are likewise allowable over the prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

The Office Action rejects Claims 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '530 Lin patent. As discussed above in relation to the § 102(a) rejections, Claim 27 has been amended to recite that the floor covering comprises at least one inclined surface that slopes downward and away from a top surface of the floor covering to a floor. Applicant submits that the '530 Lin patent does not teach or suggest a floor covering with at least one inclined surface. Accordingly, Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons that Claim 27 is patentable over the prior art, Claims 31-34 are likewise allowable over the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims of the present application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Appl No.: 10/759,167
Filed: January 20, 2004
Amdt. Dated: September 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Gegg
Registration No. 50,857
Telephone No. 704-444-1024

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30071513v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2006.